

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 1 and 9-11 are allowable.

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 9 and 12 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 12. It is believed that these changes introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 7-8, and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 7-8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,426,641 to Afrashteh et al. (hereinafter “Afrashteh”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,591,774 to Ferris et al. (hereinafter “Ferris”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. (MPEP §2143.) Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claims 2 and 12 recites in pertinent part “wherein the multiple inverter branches *comprise* at least a first a *first, a second, a third, a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth transistor*, each having a drain, a source, and a gate, wherein the *gates* of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth transistors *are coupled to receive a signal to turn on and/or turn off the respective transistors*, wherein the sources of the first, third, and fifth transistors are coupled to the drains of the second, fourth, and sixth transistors, and to the RF power amplifier” (emphasis added). Support for these changes according to at least one embodiment can be found in Applicants’ Specification at page 8, line 18 to page 9, line 14, and in Figure 5.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Afrashteh and Ferris fails to teach or fairly suggest the each and every element of the claimed invention. For example, the combination of Afrashteh and Ferris fails to teach “wherein the multiple inverter branches *comprise* at least a first a *first, a second, a third, a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth transistor*, each having a drain, a source, and a gate, wherein the *gates* of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and

sixth transistors *are coupled to receive a signal to turn on and/or turn off the respective transistors*, wherein the sources of the first, third, and fifth transistors are coupled to the drains of the second, fourth, and sixth transistors, and to the RF power amplifier” as recited in claims 2 and 12. Because the combination of Afrashteh and Ferris fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 2 and 12 are patentable over the combination of Afrashteh and Ferris.

Claims 4 and 7-8 properly depend from claim 2, which Applicants respectfully submit is patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4 and 7-8 are patentable are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 2 is patentable. MPEP §2143.03 provides that if an independent claim is unobvious, then any claim depending from the independent claim is unobvious (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 2, 4, 7-8, and 12.

Rejection of Claims 5-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Afrashteh in view of Ferris in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No.2002/0196086 to Sowalti (hereinafter “Sowalti”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 5-6 properly depend from claim 2, which Applicants respectfully submit is patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-6 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 2 is patentable. (See MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 5-6.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot, and that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 5/1/2006

Jan Little-Washington
Jan Little-Washington
Reg. No. 41,181
(206) 292-8600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL (if applicable)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on May 1, 2006
Date of Deposit

Yuko Tanaka
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

U. Tanaka may 1, 2006
Signature Date